Internet Archive
Explore
13 May 2016 - 21:44:29GMT
Go
APR
13
2016
Close this message

KASHMIR
READER
Iron stocks WWII Holocaust Networth
Yasir's injury a cause for concern ahead of England tour

IAS in Kashmir: Glorifying Occupation

By reader on May 14, 2016 - 23 Comments

Print This Post

Share
Tweet
+1
Share

Thy Rod Dur, Umar Lateef Misgar, Harun Lone

Once a child is born from the womb of a Kashmiri mother, he becomes anti-Indian by default. While growing up, family arguments, social compulsions or economic constraints may influence his political behaviour but the sentiment of resistance always exists. A child born amidst conflict is never a normal child. At every stage of life his choices are vastly different from normal children. Sometimes he may ignore his basic existence and collaborate with the occupier. If Kashmir was to be a sovereign state, both internally and externally, nobody would disagree that Kashmir youths resisting Indian occupation, and staying away from the latter's machinery, would have joined civil services as a career option. And it isn't just the fact that the conflict shapes this alienation from bureaucracy, but it is a morally and politically empirical process too.

A Colonial Legacy

During British imperial rule in India, the civil service was introduced during the reign of Lord Cornwallis. Initially, only white people were eligible. But in 1853, the term 'Indian Civil Service' made an entry into the colonial lexicon of British India and it was in this year that Satyendranath Tagore became the first native to qualify ICS. The number of Indians who joined ICS increased gradually and Brahmins were able to create a class of civil servants who were less Indian but served foreign interests in their own land.

Unlike the class of freedom fighters who were educated in foreign lands and resisted British rule, this class of British-lifted bureaucrats worked exactly in the opposite manner. It was through this class that the British strengthened their stranglehold on the Indian subcontinent. A fact that was acknowledged by the British PM David Lloyd George himself who, while speaking in the House of Commons in 1933, said that ICS was "the steel frame on which the whole structure of government in India rests". These civil servants were always embroiled in a haste with Indian freedom fighters who were framed as an important apparatus of the British. This prompted Jawaharlal Nehru to historically remark that the ICS was "neither Indian, nor civil, nor service". Subash Chandra Bose, India's Netaji, stood fourth in the ICS batch of 1920. He reported for training but resigned in 1921 and later established the Indian National Army, becoming a legendary freedom fighter.

When India finally managed to liberate itself from British imperialism, the ICS remained as such albeit with a change in nomenclature. It became the Indian Administrative Service. The same exists till date and has been extended to Jammu & Kashmir.

Bureaucratic Perspective

Bureaucracy finds its origin in the French word "bureau" which means desk. Thus, bureaucracy implies a system of administration which operates from the desk or table. To break it down further, bureaucracy refers to governance through bureaucrats. Max Weber, the 20th century sociologist, described bureaucracy as a system of administration characterised by experience, neutrality and absence of humanity. He propounded that bureaucracy is an administrative system designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals. 'Bureaucratic' in the subcontinent is also used interchangeably with the word 'civil servants', which literally means servants of the public; though the Indian media has devised a new name for this class viz. "babus", and the system, "babudom".

As Weber pointed out, it is actually those civil servants who run the daily affairs of government in a country and exercise the power of elected representatives in real terms. Though members of the executive are elected through an election the functions of the executive are essentially translated onto the ground by these civil servants. It is here that civil servants have the instrument of unbridled power. The transfer of real power from elected representatives to bureaucrats is a brazen violation of democratic democratisation principles and a process not contested to, de facto, by the people.

That Sardar Patel would go on to recognise the 'valiant efforts' of these civil servants in uniting India gives us a picture of how vital a position they occupied within the power hierarchy of independent India. Patel even anticipated a collapse of the country had this class not existed. Thus, after independence, the power organisations remained intact, just the nomenclature changed. This is exactly true in Kashmir where India laid down the same base and cultivated an exemplified collaborative class.

Marx becomes relevant here too. He thought of a 'proletariat revolution' against capitalism but not of a 'student rebellion' against it, as students also are exploited like workers, but students aren't directly as exploited as workers. In that case, IAS is a bigger monster and other jobs are lesser evils. IAS is neither a class nor a stratum. It is an symbol of the dissection of society into classes (which state uses) and class struggles (which ordinary people do), since its utility is to safeguard the recognition of the rules of an order (an order established by violence) and to administer it, but in need of being prepared in comprehensive terms and maintained by force). So, IAS is "normality" at the service of a dominant class.

How Our Society Sees Them

Coming to Kashmir, since the black henchmen of Indian occupation play a more pervasive role in helping to consolidate the illegal rule of India over the insurgent nation. This new breed – *Fanzal'laas* et al – proudly proclaim to be "Indians". And the tragedy of our nation is that they are positioned at the topmost level of the "respect pyramid". Parents fight to turn them into "in-laws". Students get lured into the glitter of this mercenary contos. But glitter is all it is. One wash, and the blood begins to seep. Innocent blood, of children, humans. Tears of widowed mothers. Broken limbs and lives of tortured women and men. Screams of raped men and women.

This section of Kashmiri society, and they are many by now, who find no wrong in Kashmiris opting for civil services, argue that a corruption-free society has to be realised and for that we need honest bureaucrats at the helm. What they misbelieve is that corruption is integral to every society and to think that an independent Kashmir will have zero corruption is a gross misunderstanding. With the demand for independence and resistance against occupation, we are not yearning for a Platonic ideal state. Rather we are demanding a resolution to the longstanding conflict after which any alien entity has no say whatsoever in our political, social or economic affairs.

Some others argue that the lack of sufficient employment opportunities in Kashmir is responsible for pushing youth towards civil services. If, for the sake of argument, we accept that, there arises a visible contradiction in the existing scenario: that is statistics suggesting that most of the qualifiers are employees of some department or the other before they go for civil services. What prompts them to become civil servants? Positively not.